This is a summary. Complete Need and Demand Survey available for review at District Headquarters, 11500 Skyline Blvd., Oakland, Ca.

THE EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT

NEED AND DEMAND SURVEY

=Tyler research associates
Recr. Mun. parks East bay
" Surveys " " "

A Two-Phase Research Study

Conducted On Behalf Of

THE EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBRARY
APR 1 1976
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

By

TYLER RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC.
850 Battery Street
San Francisco, California 94111

January, 1976
Project #95026

SB483
E25
T9
1976
IGSL
UCB

ABOUT THE STUDY

Background And Objectives Of The East Bay Regional Park District Need And Demand Study

As originally stated in your request for proposal, the basic objectives of this study were:

- "To investigate and assess community awareness, attitudes, expectations, use and behavior toward the East Bay Regional Park District;
- To evaluate the various facilities and services provided by the District;
- To collect demographic information about users and non-users for program planning; and
- To collect data related to the mode of transportation used by patrons."

To accomplish these basic objectives, we conducted a two-phase study, as follows:

Phase I -- 1,500 telephone and personal interviews with a supplemented telephone Probability Sample of adult residents of the East Bay Regional Park District.

The informational objectives of this phase were:

- To explore relevant attitudinal, behavioral and demographic patterns among a projectable sample of adult residents of the District;
- To identify users and non-users of EBRPD parklands.

Interviews were conducted with independent telephone Probability Samples of the four EBRPD sub-regions during November, 1975 as follows:

West Metropolitan Area	=	725 Telephone Interviews
Diablo Area	=	280 Telephone Interviews
South Metropolitan Area	=	252 Telephone Interviews
Amador Valley Area	=	202 Telephone Interviews
TOTAL	=	1,459 Telephone Interviews

Within each phone directory covering the District, all working exchanges were noted. Telephone numbers were then drawn by systematic randomizing procedures from each directory. Numbers from all working exchanges were included to the extent that they occur in each area.

To correct for the fact that many telephone numbers are unlisted, additional randomized phone numbers were generated from the ones selected at random from the directories, on a ten-to-one basis.

Because some households in the District do not have telephones, personal interviews were conducted with 41 households selected at random from District neighborhoods with a high proportion of non-telephone-owning households. The entire sample for Phase I therefore, was 1,500 interviews in total.

During data processing, a separate weighting factor was applied to data from each of the sub-regions in order to produce a proportionate total sample of residents from the entire East Bay Regional Park District. Data from this total sample are projectable to all residents in telephone-owning households within the EBRPD.

Interpreting The Data From Phase I

In every study where less than 100% of the universe in question is interviewed, there is some possible error attributable to sampling. Table I shows the sampling tolerance levels for the various samples discussed in this report in reference to Phase I.

Table I

	Size of Sample On Which Survey Result is Based	Approximate Sampling Tolerances for a Survey Percentage At or Near These Levels*				
		10% or 90%	20% or 80%	30% or 70%	40% or 60%	50%
All EBRPD Adult Residents	1500	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%
West Metropolitan Sub-region	725	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%
Diablo Sub-region	280	4%	6%	6%	7%	7%
South Metropolitan Sub-region	252	5%	6%	7%	8%	8%
Amador Valley Sub-region	202	5%	7%	8%	8%	9%
EBRPD Park Users	1363	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%
EBRPD Park Non-Users	137	7%	9%	10%	11%	11%

For example, on a question where 90% of those in the sample of all EBRPD Adult Residents respond with a certain answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that this result would not vary more than two percentage points, plus or minus, from what we would have found had we interviewed all Adult Residents throughout the District.

As Table I indicates, the limits of possible error become larger for percentages nearer 50 and smaller for those nearer 100 or 0. When the size of the sample is smaller, the possible sampling error increases.

*At the 95 in 100 Level of Confidence.

Sampling tolerances are also involved in the comparison of different sub-groups within a sample and in the comparison of results between two different samples. A difference, in other words, must be at least of a certain size to be considered statistically meaningful. Table II is a guide to the sampling tolerances applicable to such comparisons.

Table II

Sizes of Samples Compared	Approximate Sampling Tolerances for Differences Between Two Survey Percentages at or Near These Levels*				
	10% or 90%	20% or 80%	30% or 70%	40% or 60%	50%
1363 and 137	7%	9%	10%	11%	11%
725 and 280	6%	7%	8%	8%	9%
725 and 252	6%	7%	8%	9%	9%
725 and 202	6%	8%	9%	9%	10%
280 and 252	7%	8%	10%	10%	11%
280 and 202	7%	9%	10%	11%	11%
252 and 202	8%	9%	11%	11%	11%

For example, if the survey showed that 90% of the EBRPD Park Users (1363 respondents) did or believed something, and only 82% of the Park Non-Users (137 respondents) did or believed the same thing, this would be a statistically meaningful difference, since there are 95 chances in 100 that any difference over 7 percentage points (first line, first column) is not due to chance fluctuations.

*At the 95 in 100 Level of Confidence.

For ease of reading, data bases have not been repeated on the tables in this section of the report since all percentages shown were calculated on weighted bases. Although weighted bases were used in the calculations of percentages shown, the reader should keep in mind the actual numbers of interviews conducted when assessing the meaningfulness of differences among various categories of respondents.

Phase II -- 732 on-site personal interviews with visitors to nine EBRPD parks, as follows:

Tilden	=	185 Interviews	.10 Interviewer days
Crown Beach	=	120 Interviews	7 Interviewer days
Chabot	=	106 Interviews	7 Interviewer days
Shadow Cliffs	=	78 Interviews	5 Interviewer days
Contra Loma	=	70 Interviews	5 Interviewer days
Briones	=	68 Interviews	4 Interviewer days
Sunol	=	58 Interviews	5 Interviewer days
Las Trampas	=	33 Interviews	* Interviewer days
Alameda Creek Trail	=	14 Interviews	2 Interviewer days

Total = 732 Interviews

Interviewing was conducted during October 3-8, 1975, by Tyler Research Associates' professional interviewers. In Sunol, Contra Loma, Briones, and Alameda Creek Trail, all interviewing was conducted on the Sunday during that period. In the other parks, the bulk of the interviewing was conducted on that Sunday, but some interviewing was also conducted on weekdays during that period.

Respondents were selected by using a randomizing procedure designed to make the sample as closely representative as possible of all men and women sixteen years of age or older entering the area that day. The sample cannot be considered a probability (projectable) sample of all EBRPD visitors or all visitors to the specific parks in question.

*Interviewing in Las Trampas was conducted by Gordon Vinther of the EBRPD staff.

The informational objectives of this phase were:

- To further define the EBRPD user group;
- To assess reactions to the EBRPD parks and their facilities among a representative sample of park visitors;
- To obtain park visitors' perceptions of what facilities, etc. are needed.

In Conclusion

We would like to acknowledge here the fine cooperation and the help given us by many of the East Bay Regional Park District Staff, and members of the Board of Directors, the Citizens Task Force, and the Public Agency Advisory Committee.

In particular, we wish to express our appreciation to Richard C. Trudeau, General Manager of the East Bay Regional Park District, and to Jay M. Ver Lee.

Further detail about the study may be obtained from Mr. Trudeau or from John M. Tyler, President, Tyler Research Associates, Inc., 850 Battery Street, San Francisco.

As stipulated by the Code of Ethics of the American Association of Public Opinion Research, we are required to maintain the anonymity of all respondents. No information can be released that in any way will reveal the identity of a respondent. Also, our authorization is required for any publication of research findings or their implications.

SUMMARY

SECTION I - A TELEPHONE PROBABILITY SAMPLE OF ADULT RESIDENTS OF THE EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT

Incidence And Frequency Of EBRPD Park Visitation By Adult Residents Of The District

The overwhelming majority (90%) of adult residents of the District have visited an EBRPD park at one time or another. In terms of the total number of EBRPD parks they have ever visited, District adults have been to an average of five District parks. These Park Users are most likely to have visited parks located close to their homes, i.e., in the District sub-region where they live. Exceptions to this pattern are Tilden, visited by more than one-half of the residents of all four sub-regions, and Redwood (Roberts), visited by more than three in ten in each sub-region.

Within the past year, nearly seven District adults in ten (68%) visited an EBRPD park. An additional two in ten (22%) have visited a District park, but not within the past year.

In terms of the frequency of their visits, District adults make an average of six trips a year to a District park. Frequency of usage of the District's parks tends to increase with education and access to an automobile, and to decrease with age.

Demographic Profiles Of EBRPD Park Users And Non-Users Who Are Adult Residents Of The District

Usage of the EBRPD parklands is high among all population sub-groups and sub-regions throughout the District. Substantial majorities of residents from all educational and income levels, age categories, racial sub-groups, and all other demographic categories use the EBRPD parks. However, the likelihood of having used an EBRPD park tends to decrease slightly with age (especially for those aged 65 and over) and to increase with education, income, and access to an automobile.

The following characteristics are those on which there are statistically significant differences between EBRPD District adults who are Park Users and those who are Park Non-Users:

	EBRPD ADULTS	
	Park Users	Park Non-Users
Own/Have access to automobile	93%	85%
Reside in households composed of two or more persons	83	72
Reside in households with children under 18 years of age	49	33
Have at least some college education	57	38
Are under 40 years of age	59	40
Are employed, either full-time or part-time	65	46
Are housewives, students, unemployed workers	35	53

There are no statistically meaningful differences between Park Users and Park Non-Users on other demographic characteristics, such as sex, racial/ethnic background, and marital status.

Awareness Of The East Bay Regional Park District As The Agency Which Operates These Parks

A minority (22%) of District adults are able to name, on an unaided basis, the East Bay Regional Park District (or any of the name variations the District uses) as the agency which operates the various parks. However, an additional 63% have heard of the District when the name is read to them. In total, then, 85% of District adult residents are aware of the East Bay Regional Park District.

EBRPD Park Users' Satisfaction With The District Parks They Have Visited And Suggestions For Improvement Of The East Bay Regional Park District System

Among District Park Users, satisfaction with the parks and what they have to offer is at very high levels. 62% of those who have used the District's parks say they are very satisfied, and an additional 32% say they are somewhat satisfied, with the parks. There is no significant difference in satisfaction with the parks among recent Park Users and those who have not used them in the past year. This suggests that the reasons for non-recent park use among park-goers have little to do with satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the parks themselves.

Although Park Users have a multitude of specific suggestions for ways in which the East Bay Regional Park system might be improved, no one suggestion is offered by even one Park User in ten. Nearly two Park Users in ten (18%) feel that the East Bay Regional Park system is fine just the way it is, and have no suggestions for improvements. The most frequent types of suggestions Park Users do have are in the general category of more recreational facilities (28%). About one Park User in ten mentions suggestions in the following general categories:

- Stricter enforcement of park regulations (11%);
- Improvement of the cleanliness of the parks (10%);
- More public convenience facilities (fountains, etc.) (9%);
- Expanded or improved restroom facilities (9%).

Reasons For Non-Use Of The EBRPD Parks And Non-Users' Perceptions Of What Might Be Done To Encourage Them To Use The Parks

The principal reasons for non-use of the EBRPD parks have little to do with the parks themselves. The most often given reason for never having visited an EBRPD park is a lack of available time, mentioned by 34% of Park Non-Users. The other principal reasons accounting for park non-use are:

- Being new to the area (18%);
- Feeling that they are too old to go to the parks (12%);
- Not liking parks in general (10%).

More than four Non-Users in ten (44%) say that there is nothing that the District could do to encourage them to use the EBRPD parks. 17% say that if the District would advertise the parks more, they might be more likely to use them. About one Park Non-User in ten (9%) says that the District should make their parks safer, have more rangers on patrol.

The Importance Of Various Aspects Of The Park Experience

In reacting to twelve statements about various aspects of the park visiting experience which might affect their selection of a park to visit, District adults indicate that personal security is a key item. Nine in ten (91%) rate protection against crime in the park a very important consideration in selecting a park to visit. Better than eight in ten (83%) rate the enforcement of rules and regulations concerning use of the park as very important. More than seven in ten (73%) consider it very important that information is available about the park and what it has to offer. Between five and six in ten rate the following items very important:

- The opportunity to do something physically active (60%);
- The opportunity to get away from people (59%);
- Free admission and parking (58%);
- The chance to do nothing (55%).

The most popular activities which a park might offer, according to District adults, are: picnicking (96%), loafing and relaxing on the lawn (92%), and sightseeing (91%). Each of these activities is mentioned by more than nine District adults in ten as something they or their family members would actually do in a park. At least seven in ten mention:

- Barbecuing (85%);
- Looking at exhibits in a nature center (83%);
- Hiking (83%);
- Swimming (78%);
- Playing outdoor sports, like softball, football, soccer, etc. (75%);
- Fishing (70%).

SECTION II - ON-SITE INTERVIEWS WITH PARK VISITORS AT NINE OF THE EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT PARKLANDS

The on-site interviewing portion of this study served two purposes:

- To gather information from visitors in nine of the EBRPD parklands regarding their reactions to the park they were visiting, their experiences in the specific park, their demographic profile, etc.;
- To establish procedures, questionnaires, and sampling approaches which could be replicated in other parklands at other points in time, thus enabling a monitoring of visitors to the various EBRPD parklands over time.

The informational output of this portion of the study is stated in the form of hypotheses, which can be tested and amplified as visitors to other EBRPD parks and to the nine parks studied are interviewed during various seasons of the year.

HYPOTHESIS 1: EBRPD parks attract a substantial majority of their visitors from within a twenty-five mile driving distance of their location.

HYPOTHESIS 2: A substantial majority of park visitors travel to EBRPD parks by private automobile.

HYPOTHESIS 3: A majority of EBRPD park visitors don't go to the parks alone. Most visit the parks in groups of two to four people.

HYPOTHESIS 4: EBRPD park visitor groups typically include at least two adults.

HYPOTHESIS 5: Among those visiting the EBRPD parks which have been open the longest, a sizeable proportion have been visiting them for several years (3.5 years or more).

HYPOTHESIS 6: Within each park a substantial minority of visitors are first-time visitors.

HYPOTHESIS 7: A majority of visitors to each EBRPD park visit that park five times or more a year.

HYPOTHESIS 8: Park visitors learn of EBRPD parks they visit from several sources. The primary reported source is word-of-mouth.

HYPOTHESIS 9: Very few park-goers report learning of the EBRPD parks they visit via newspapers, magazines, or other commercial channels of communication.

HYPOTHESIS 10: Even among those who visit the District's parks, top-of-mind awareness of the East Bay Regional Park District (or any of the name variations the District uses) as the agency which operates the parks is at moderately low levels.

HYPOTHESIS 11: A substantial majority of EBRPD park visitors have heard of the East Bay Regional Park District.

HYPOTHESIS 12: The more EBRPD parks an individual visits, the more likely the individual is to be aware of the East Bay Regional Park District.

HYPOTHESIS 13: The great majority of EBRPD park visitors have also visited other EBRPD parks. On the average, park-goers have visited five of the agency's parks in total.

HYPOTHESIS 14: Tilden, Redwood, Temescal, and Chabot parks are among the most widely visited of the 27 EBRPD parks.

HYPOTHESIS 15: Park-goers do not limit their visits to only one type of EBRPD parklands, but typically visit other parklands which provide quite different experiences.

HYPOTHESIS 16: Visitors to the EBRPD parks enjoy widely varying experiences in the parks. Primary among these experiences are the activities available in the park, and the natural environment of the parks.

HYPOTHESIS 17: Among visitors to the parks, there are few negatives associated with the park experience.

HYPOTHESIS 18: Various additional recreational facilities and improvements to the grounds of the parks are the changes that park visitors would appreciate the most.

HYPOTHESIS 19: Picnicking, hiking, loafing/sunbathing on the lawn, and sightseeing are among the more popular activities at the EBRPD parks.

HYPOTHESIS 20: A sizeable majority of visitors to EBRPD parks believe the park system adequately serves the needs of the residents of the District.

HYPOTHESIS 21: No general consensus exists among EBRPD park visitors on ways to improve the system. The most common suggestions include the adding of recreational facilities and expanding the existing parks/developing more parks.

HYPOTHESIS 22: A majority of EBRPD park visitors would be in favor of paying moderately higher entrance and/or facility fees to help finance improvements to, or expansion of, the park system.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C101743095

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The East Bay Regional Park District is doing an excellent job of attracting a large and representative number of District residents to its parks, both overall and within each of the four sub-regions. With two exceptions, all population sub-groups are appropriately represented among the visitors to the EBRPD parklands. The sub-groups which are underrepresented among EBRPD Park Users are the segment 65 years of age and older, and the segment without access to an automobile.

Levels of satisfaction with the EBRPD parks and what they have to offer are high. Suggestions for improvements are all at low levels, but the general area of providing more recreational facilities shows the highest level of interest. 28% of EBRPD Park Users mention the desirability of adding more recreational facilities, with some 19 specific facilities being included in this summary category.

There is an essentially non-interested segment of the public which will continue to be Park Non-Users despite the best efforts of EBRPD. Other Park Non-Users indicate, however, that they would be more likely to become Park Users if there were:

- More intensive formal communications to inform people of the system, of the locations of specfic parks, of the facilities and activities available in the various parks, etc.;
- The provision and promotion of public transportation to and from the parks;
- The organization and promotion of activities and programs which would appeal to persons who currently feel they are too old to go to parks;
- Guarantees and reassurances concerning their personal safety in the parks.

The data verify District residents' concern with the personal safety issue in the decision as to whether to visit a park. There is some sentiment for the idea of more rangers and better control of the parks. Of all the specific suggestions for improvement offered by Park Users, this single item was mentioned more frequently than any other (9%).